

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
**F9411**

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
**PCT/JP2004/015730**

International filing date (day/month/year)  
**22.10.2004**

Priority date (day/month/year)  
**24.10.2003**

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

**Autoliv Development AB**

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/015730

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language  
\_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/015730

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	3-8, 10, 12-14	YES
	Claims	1, 2, 9, 11	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	3, 5-8, 10, 12, 14	YES
	Claims	1, 2, 4, 9, 11, 13	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-14	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:	<p>Document 1: Microfilm of the specification and drawings annexed to the request of Japanese Utility Model Application No. 106299/1989 (Laid-open Utility Model No. 44060/1991), (Tokai Rika Co., Ltd.), 24 April 1991, pages 10, line 11 to page 13, line 14</p> <p>Document 2: JP 3-148350 A (Autoflug GmbH &amp; Co. Fahrzeugtechnik), 25 June 1991, Figs. 1 to 7 &amp; GB 2235124 A &amp; DE 4022571 A &amp; FR 2650234 A &amp; IT 1247387 B</p> <p>Document 3: JP 1-202553 A (Britax-Kolb GmbH. &amp; Co.), 15 August 1989, Figs. 1 to 4 &amp; EP 0315955 A &amp; US 4978087 A &amp; DE 3887454 C</p> <p>Document 4: JP 7-89412 A (NSK Ltd.), 4 April 1995, paragraph 0012 &amp; US 5495993 A</p> <p>The inventions of claims 1 and 2 are described in document 1 (page 10, line 11 to page 13, line 14) cited in the ISR, and therefore do not appear to be novel or to involve an inventive step.</p> <p>The invention of claim 4 does not appear to involve an inventive step over the above document 1 and document 4 (paragraph 0012). Application of the sensor malfunction mechanism described in document 4 to the retractor described in document 1 to conceive of the invention of claim 4 could be easily achieved by a party skilled in the art.</p> <p>The inventions of claims 9 and 11 are described in document 2 (Figs. 1 to 7) and document 3 (Figs. 1 to 4) cited in the ISR, and therefore do not appear to be novel or to involve an inventive step.</p> <p>The invention of claim 13 does not appear to involve an inventive step over the above document 2, document 3, or document 4 (paragraph 0012). Application of the sensor malfunction mechanism described in document 4 to the retractor described in document 2 or document 3 to conceive of the invention of claim 13 could be easily achieved by a party skilled in the art.</p> <p>The inventions of claims 3, 5-8, 10, 12 and 14 are neither described in any of the documents cited in the ISR nor obvious to a party skilled in the art.</p>		